

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 14, 16 to 18, and 20 to 31 are pending and being considered in the present application. In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, 26 to 28, 30, and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, 26 to 28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001-119451 ("Andreas") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,126,583 ("Breed").

Claim 14 recites:

providing the services in a speed-dependent manner, wherein:
at least one service uses at least one input medium;
at least one service uses at least one output medium, including
at least one video output medium that includes at least two display adaptations of one service, while in an active state;
the providing of the services includes providing at least one of
a control of a selection of the services and a representation of the
services on a user interface present in the motor vehicle; and
*performing a speed-dependent adaptation of the at least one
video output medium from one active state to another active state.*

It is admitted that Andreas does not disclose "*at least one video output medium that includes at least two display adaptations of one service.*" It is additionally admitted that Andreas does not disclose "*performing a speed-dependent adaptation of the at least one video output medium from one active state to another active state.*" For these features, Breed is cited. However, Breed does not disclose these features. Nowhere in Breed is any speed-dependent action taken. For example, the Office action cites col. 14, lines 38 to 67 and col. 15, lines 1 to 4 as stating that "they are used to help in speed situations." Col. 14 states "provide a heads up display which is only illuminated when it is in use." This makes no mention of a speed-dependent adaptation of a video output, nor of anything speed-dependent. Col. 15 states "provide a heads up display and touch pad or voice input system for a vehicle to permit the vehicle operator to dial a phone number on a cellular phone without taking his eyes from the road." This may improve driver safety, but it does not perform any function as a speed-dependent adaptation of a video output. Absolutely no part

of Breed satisfies the claim limitation of “*performing a speed-dependent adaptation of the at least one video output medium from one active state to another active state.*”

As to “*at least one video output medium that includes at least two display adaptations of one service, while in an active state,*” cited col. 16, lines 38 to 67 states:

The vehicle can also include determining means for determining a desired location of the eyes of the occupant relative to the projected text and/or graphics (possibly via a determination of the position of the occupant's head and then using tables to approximate the location of the eyes) and **adjustment means coupled to a seat of the vehicle on which the occupant is situated for adjusting the seat** based on the determined desired location of the eyes of the occupant to thereby move the occupant and thus the occupant's eyes and enable the occupant's view of the projected text and/or graphics to be improved . . .

Instead of adjusting the seat, the projecting means can be adjusted based on the desired **location of the occupant's eyes relative to the text and/or graphics**. That is, adjustment means are coupled to the projecting means for adjusting the projecting means based on the determined desired **location of the eyes of the occupant relative to the projected text and/or graphics** to thereby **enable the occupant's view of the projected text and/or graphics to be improved**.

The first paragraph, is clearly irrelevant, as the only adjustment is performed on the occupant seat, and not on a “video output medium.” The second paragraph is asserted as disclosing that Breed “can change text and graphics and location.” Nowhere in this section is there any mention of changing text or graphics. Only the *position* of the projection is changed relative to the eyes of the occupant, so as to put the fixed text/graphics in the occupants field of vision. Whether the *fixed* image is located at point “A” in the vehicle, or located at point “B” in the vehicle is irrelevant to “*at least two display adaptations of one service, while in an active state.*” There is no indication that the display is changed at all if in one position or the other. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Breed fails to disclose both features it is cited against.

Accordingly, the combination of Andreas and Breed does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 14, so that the combination of Andreas and Breed does not render unpatentable claim 14 or any of its dependent claims, e.g., claims 16 to 18, 20, 27, 28, 30, and 31.

Claims 26 includes subject matter analogous to that discussed above in support of the patentability of claim 14, so that the combination of Andreas and Breed does not render unpatentable claim 26 for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, 26 to 28, 30 and 31 is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 21 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 21 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Andreas in view of Breed, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,860 ("Wawra").

Claims 21 and 29 depend from claim 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Wawra does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Breed noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claims 21 and 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Andreas in view of Breed, and in further view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 60-61923 ("Toshio").

Claim 23 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Toshio does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Breed noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Andreas in view of Breed, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,333 ("O'Neil").

Claim 24 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since O'Neil does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Breed noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Andreas in view of Breed, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,726 ("Daminani").

Claim 25 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14 since Damiani does not cure, and is not cited to cure, the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Breed noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 25 is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 25, 2009

By: /Aaron Grunberger/
Aaron Grunberger, Reg. No. 59,210 for:
Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646